

Interpretation of Table:
JAIL POPULATIONS: 1st Quarter '04 versus 1st Quarter '05

This table:

- summarizes the ADP results for the 62 jurisdictions in California reporting data from Type II, III, and IV jails;
- summarizes jurisdiction ADP results for the most recent quarter (Column C);
- compares jurisdiction ADP for the most recent quarter with the same quarter last year (Column B);
- ranks the jurisdictions in terms of gains or losses in ADP from high to low (Column D);
- lists the percentage growth or decline in ADP for each jurisdiction (Column E);
- lists the percentage of the overall State increase or decrease in ADP that is represented by each jurisdiction (Column F);
- lists, by jurisdiction, the cumulative percentage increase and decrease in the State ADP starting with the jurisdiction with the highest percentage of the increase and proceeding to the jurisdiction with the highest percentage of the decrease (Column G);
- lists, by jurisdiction, the cumulative total increase and decrease in the State ADP starting with the jurisdiction with the highest increase and proceeding to the jurisdiction with the biggest decrease (Column H); and,
- lists the jurisdictions that experienced decreases in their ADP as shaded.

Some important conclusions from this table are:

1. The two numbers at the bottom indicate the "total increase" in ADP (in this case 1,935) and "total decrease" in ADP (-608). In other words, the jurisdictions experiencing increases had a total increase of 1,935 ADP; and the jurisdictions experiencing decreases had a total decrease of 608 ADP. Subtracting 608 from 1,935 produces the overall increase of 1,327 between the first quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005.
2. The Los Angeles County ADP increase of 466 is 24.1% of the total increase of 1,935. Thirty-two jurisdictions had increases (down to Mariposa Sheriff's Department) with 3 jurisdictions reporting no increases (Mendocino, Calaveras and Shasta Sheriff's Departments). When you get to Shasta Sheriff's Department, you have accounted for 100% of the increases (100% of the cumulative total of 1,935).
3. Jurisdictions that experienced a decrease in ADP are listed from smallest decrease to largest decrease (Tehama Sheriff's Department to Sacramento Sheriff's Department). When you get to the bottom of the table, you have accounted for 100% of the total decreases of 608 inmates.
4. The cumulative percentage of ADP increase for the top four jurisdictions (Los Angeles to Tulare Sheriffs' Departments) is 65.2%. In other words, four jurisdictions accounted for over 65% of the total ADP increase. Three jurisdictions (Riverside, San Mateo, and Sacramento Sheriffs' Departments) account for about 38% of the decreases with Sacramento Sheriff's Department accounting for 15.8% of the total decrease.